UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,519	11/15/2006	Fabio Magid Bazhuni Maia	01952.0078	3504
22852 7590 04/01/2008 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER		EXAMINER		
LLP			NEWAY, BLAINE GIRMA	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4133	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/564,519	MAIA, FABIO MAGID BAZHUNI		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	BLAINE G. NEWAY	4133		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/15 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acceedable and applicant may not request that any objection to the orange.	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		· · ·		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/13/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on November 15, 2006, in which claims 1-12 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are pending of which claim 1 is in independent form.

Claim Objections

- 1. Claim1 objected to because of the following informalities: The term "produced by" is unclear. The examiner suggests changing "produced by" to "made from" to avoid confusion. Appropriate correction is required.
- 2. Claims 4-12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because multiple dependent claims 3-12. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 4-12 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apps et al (US 5,967,322) or Apps herein in view of Kingsbury (US 995,259).

Regarding claim 1, Apps discloses a box (10) for packaging an electronic voting machine (intended use), made from a resistant plastic material (column 1 lines 7-10), which includes a base, side walls, a top opening provided with a border in its periphery and a cover (figure 1).

Apps does not disclose 1- a border provided with an identification means; and 2the cover including a cut-out which permits visualization of the identification means.

Kingsbury teaches a box with a border provided with an identification means, and a cover with a cut-out which permits the visualization of the identification means (figures 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided an identification means on the border of the Apps box, as thought by Kingsbury, and a corresponding cut-out in the cover of the Apps box, to permit easy identification of the contents of the box of the combination of Apps and Kingsbury.

Regarding claim 2, Apps further discloses the box having at least one viewing window (40) located in at least one side of the box (figure 1).

Regarding claim 3, Apps further discloses the box having a shape that enables one to stack two or more boxes both in the opened or closed conditions (figures 6 and 7).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

I Goldberg (US 1,734,621)

John Tulloch (US 5,673,796)

A.L. Sheldon (US 3,690,450)

Christopher Autterson (US 2002/0066688 A1) all relate to packages with windows and labels.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAINE G. NEWAY whose telephone number is (571)270-5275. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM- 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on 571 272 4017. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Blaine G Neway/ Examiner, Art Unit 4138

2/26/2008

/Frantz Coby/ Supervisory Patent Examiner Art Unit 4133 Application/Control Number: 10/564,519

Page 6

Art Unit: 4133